REMARKS

Claims 7-17 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 7-17 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 7 and 17 were amended, and claim 9 was cancelled.

Accordingly, claims 7-17 are at issue in the above-identified application.

§ 112 Objection

Applicants have amended claim 17 per the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 7-13, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narang et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,168,885) in view of *Schneider et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,180,281) in view of *Gozdz et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,840,087) in view of *Kawakami et al.* (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0064710). Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narang et al.* in view of *Schneider et al.* in view of *Gozdz et al.* in view of *Kawakami et al.* as applied to claims 7-13, 16, and 17 above, and further in view of *Oliver et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,688,293).

Amended claim 7, from which claims 8, 10-16 depend, recites a method of manufacturing a solid-electrolyte battery comprising subjecting wound electrodes to heat treatment at *70°C* so that the solid-electrolyte layers formed on the positive electrode and the solid-electrolyte layers formed on the negative electrode are integrated with each other into one continuous seamless layer.

Amended claim 17 also recites subjecting said wound electrodes to heat treatment *at 70°C* so that said solid-electrolyte layers formed on said positive electrode and said solid-

electrolyte layers formed on said negative electrode are integrated with each other into one continuous seamless layer.

In contrast, *Narang et al* does not disclose nor suggest subject wound electrodes to heat treatment at 70°C. Rather, *Narang et al* discloses the method having a lamination step wherein two polymer electrolyte coated electrodes are laminated together to provide an electro-chemical cell, but not with a heat treatment process. Additionally, *Schneider et al.* discloses forming a separator electrode structure that is immobilized on a drum vacuum surface and coated on a side of the separator (the "second separator side") with the second electrode slurry. (See *Schneider et al.*, column 8, lines 21-25). However, the structure is formed by means of a *vacuum* process and not a heat treatment process at *70°C.*

Furthermore, *Gozdz et al.* discloses that, prior to assembly and lamination at a step C, a carrier film 62 is removed to expose unblemished surfaces of a facing separator/electrolyte layer 64, which then is laminated under *reduced* temperature and pressure conditions to effect a homogenous, cohesive bond to complete battery cell 50. However, *Gozdz et al.* fails to teach subjecting said structure to heat treatment at *70°C* upon laminating said structure as required by claims 7 and 17.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, either alone or in any combination, teach each and every limitation found in claims 7 and 17, and specifically subjecting wound electrodes to heat treatment at *70°C* so that the solid-electrolyte layers formed on the positive electrode and the solid-electrolyte layers formed on the negative electrode are integrated with each other into one continuous seamless layer.

Claims 8, and 10-16 all depend directly from claim 7 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reason that claim 7 is allowable.

As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

(Reg. No. 32,919)

David R. Metzger
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P. O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Customer No. 26263

11811211v1